

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

SUBJECT: CLEAN AIR ACT INSPECTION REPORT

Solenis LLC, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

FROM: Vicky Mei, Environmental Engineer

AECAB (IL/IN)

THRU: Nathan Frank, Section Supervisor

AECAB (IL/IN)

TO: File

BASIC INFORMATION

Facility Name: Solenis LLC

Facility Location: 5228 N. Hopkins Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Date of Virtual Inspection: September 27, 2022 **Date of On-site Inspection:** September 28, 2022

EPA Inspectors:

- 1. Vicky Mei, Environmental Engineer
- 2. Danny Nguyen, Environmental Engineer (at virtual inspection only)

Other Attendees

- 1. Scott Thomson, Plant Manager
- 2. Jim Faulstich, Corporate EHS Manager (at virtual inspection only)
- 3. Keith Budreau, Production Planner (at virtual inspection only)
- 4. Pat Elliott, Administrator (at virtual inspection only)
- 5. Abby Wojtanowski, EHS Manager
- 6. Jay Swann, Process Project Engineer (at virtual inspection only)

Contact Email Address: sthomson@solenis.com

Purpose of Inspection: 40 C.F.R. Part 68: Chemical Accident Prevention Provisions (CAPP)

Facility Type: Plastics material and resin manufacturer

Regulations Central to Inspection: 40 C.F.R. Part 68: CAPP

Arrival Time of Virtual Inspection: 9:00 AM CST **Departure Time of Virtual Inspection:** 2:30 PM CST

Arrival Time of On-site Inspection: 11:00 AM CST **Departure Time of On-site Inspection:** 12:15 PM CST

Inspection Type:

☐ Unannounced Inspection

OPENING CONFERENCE

Stated authority and purpose of inspection

☐ Small Business Resource Information Sheet not provided

The following information was obtained verbally from Solenis staff and through a CAPP document review unless otherwise noted.

Process Description:

The facility produces chemical additives, such as kymene, for the paper and pulp industry. The Process entails epichlorohydrin (EPI) arriving on tanker trucks, isotainers, or rail cars for use in its container or to be transferred into a 106,000-pound working capacity storage tank, and then being piped to one of 3 reactors as a reactant to create kymene. The reaction occurs in 6 to 10-hour batches. The reactor sizes are 2,000, 6,000, and 7,000 gallons.

Staff Interview:

The facility started in 1906. The facility has a union that has decided to not participate in the inspection. There are 15 employees working on the Process. Tankers of EPI may be received at any time and day of the week. About 2 railcars are received per month. The maximum capacity for EPI is 650,000 pounds. The facility operates the chemical operations for 24 hours on 5 days per week in 3 shifts. The facility is a non-responder and works with the local fire department and Clean Harbors to handle emergencies.

TOUR INFORMATION

EPA Tour of the Facility: Yes

Data Collected and Observations:

EPA conducted an extensive document review of the facility's CAPP on September 27, 2022. EPA toured the facility on September 28, 2022 during the on-site inspection and saw the EPI Process.

Photos and/or Videos: were not taken during the inspection.

Field Measurements: were not taken during this inspection.

RECORDS REVIEW

- 1. Management structure
- 2. Off-site consequence analysis
- 3. Process safety information
- 4. Process hazard analysis
- 5. Operating procedures
- 6. Lockout-tagout procedures
- 7. Training documentation
- 8. Mechanical integrity records
- 9. Management of change documentation
- 10. Pre-startup safety reviews
- 11. Compliance audits
- 12. Incident investigation reports
- 13. Employee participation program
- 14. Hot work permits
- 15. Contractor policy information
- 16. Emergency response plans and meetings

CLOSING CONFERENCE

Provided U.S. EPA point of contact to the facility

Requested documents:

- Completed hot work permits for EPI process
- Coordination with LEPC for emergency action plan or community action plan
- Sign-In sheet for on-site drill with Fire Department
- Internal drills for notification exercises
- PSSR for 6K reactor modification in 2019
- Mechanical integrity preventive maintenance frequency of testing and inspection

Concerns:

• There was no documentation on persons responsible for implementing individual requirements of the CAPP and defining of the lines of authority through an organization chart or similar document.

- Another covered process that potentially affects public receptors different from those potentially affected by the worst-case scenario was not analyzed and reported.
- For the worst-case scenario, the quantity in the rail car was assumed to be spilled over the duration of an hour, instead of instantaneously, to form a liquid pool.
- The volatilization rate was not determined for the worst-case scenario.
- The rate of release to the air from the volatilization rate of the liquid pool was not determined.
- Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperatures or pressures and proximity to the boundary of the stationary source were not considered in selecting the worst-case scenario.
- The following alternative release scenarios were not considered: transfer hose release due to splits or sudden hose uncoupling; process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, welds, valves and valve seals, and drains or bleeds; process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal failure, or drain, bleed, or plug failure; vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and venting through relief valves or rupture disks; and shipping container mishandling and breakage or puncturing leading to a spill.
- The failure scenarios identified under 68.50 were not considered in selecting the alternative release scenario.
- The following were not identified in the off-site impact analysis: the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings.
- The following were not identified in the off-site impact analysis: the environmental receptors within a circle where its center is the point of the release and a radius determined by the distance to the endpoint.
- The facility did not rely on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify environmental receptors.
- The worst-case and alternative release scenarios did not include the following documentation: the assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for selection, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and mitigation on the release quantity and rate.
- The facility has not documented that equipment complies with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices.
- The process hazard analysis did not include a qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls.
- The facility had not explained to the contract owner or operator the applicable provisions of the emergency response or the emergency action program.

DIGITAL SIGNATURES

Report Author:	 	
Section Supervisor:	 	

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist General Facility Information Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee Plant 5228 N. Hopkins Street Mailing Address Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53209 (Street, City, State, Zip): 5228 N. Hopkins Street Physical Address Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53209 (Street, City, State, Zip): 43.112500/-087.963056 Latitude/Longitude: (RMP) (Source) County: Milwaukee RMP Number/ FRS Number: 1000 0008 8451 Facility Contact (Name, Title): Scott Thomson, Plant Manager Facility Contact Phone No: 8660337-1533 Facility Contact Email: sthomson@solenis.com Reported NAICS Code(s): 325211 (Plastics Material and Resin Manufacturing) **Inspection Information** Inspection Begin Date: Inspection End Date: September 27, 2022 September 28, 2022 Arrival Time: Departure Time: 9:00 AM 12:30 PM Phone No./Email: Name: Organization: Vicky Mei **EPA** Lead Inspector 312-353-2054 mei.vicky@epa.gov Danny Nguyen **EPA** 440-250-1709 nguyen.danny@epa.gov **Participating Inspectors**

R	MP Pr	ogram Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauke	e Pk		
Sı	ıbpart	A – General [68.10-15]			
	neral rec mments:	uirements followed and implemented as in 40 CFR 68.10-15?			
Ge	neral: A	pplicability [68.10]			
1.	process	owner or operator of a stationary source that has more than a threshold quantity of a regulated substance in a , as determined under §68.115, complied with the requirements of this part no later than the latest of the ng dates [68.10(a)]:	■Y	□N	□N/A
	■ J	ne 21, 1999? [68.10(a)(1)];			
	П	hree years after the date on which a regulated substance is first listed under §68.130? [68.10(a)(2)];			
	□ T o	he date on which a regulated substance is first present above a threshold quantity in a process? [68.10(a)(3)];			
	□ F	or any revisions to this part, the effective date of the final rule that revises this part? [68.10(a)(4)]			
2.		owner or operator complied with the emergency coordination activities in accordance with §68.93 by ber 21, 2018? [68.10(b)] (See Items 2 through 5 of Subpart E)	■Y	□N	□N/A
3.	<u>within</u>	owner or operator developed and implemented an emergency response program in accordance with §68.95 three years of when the owner or operator determined that the stationary source is subject to the emergency e program requirements of §68.95? [68.10(c)] (See Items 1.b.(2) – 1.b.(7) of Subpart E)	□Ү	□N	■N/A
4.		owner or operator developed plans for conducting emergency response exercises in accordance with §68.96 ember 19, 2023? [68.10(d)] (See Items $\underline{1.b.(8)} - \underline{1.b.(17)}$, $\underline{6}$, and $\underline{7}$ of Subpart E)	□Ү	□N	■N/A
5.	reporta	owner or operator complied with the public meeting requirement in §68.210(b) within 90 days of any RMP ole accident at the stationary source with known offsite impacts specified in §68.42(a), that occurs after 15, 2021? [68.10(e)] (See Item 2 of Subpart H)	□Ү	□N	■N/A
6.	After D	ecember 19, 2024, has the owner or operator reported in the RMP submission: [68.10(f)]	$\Box Y$	\square N	■N/A
	\Box A	public meeting after an RMP reportable accident under §68.160(b)(21)? [68.10(f)(1)];			
	□ E1	nergency response program information under §68.180(a)(1)? [68.10(f)(2)];			
	□ Eı	nergency response program information under §68.180(a)(2) and (3)? [68.10(f)(3)]; and,			
		nergency response program and exercises information under $\S68.180(b)$, as applicable? Including submittal the following: $[68.10(f)(4)]$			
		Dates of the most recent notification,			
		Dates of field and tabletop exercises in the risk management plan,			
		Dates for exercises completed as required under §68.96 at the time the risk management plan is either submitted under §68.150(b)(2) or (3), or is updated under §68.190.			

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Faci	lity Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee	Pk		
General: Program Eligibility [68.10(g)-(i)]				
7. Does the covered process meet the eligibility requirements of Program	m 1? Specifically: [68.10(g)]	□Y	■N	□N/A
Does the covered process meet all of the following requirements:				
☐ For the five years prior to the submission of an RMP, the proces regulated substance where exposure to the substance, its reaction explosion involving the substance, or radiant heat generated by a following offsite? [68.10(g)(1)];	n products, overpressure generated by an			
\Box Death; [68.10(g)(1)(i)]				
□ Injury; [68.10(g)(1)(ii)] or,				
\square Response or restoration activities for an exposure of an envi	ronmental receptor; [68.10(g)(1)(iii)] and			
☐ The distance to a toxic or flammable endpoint for a worst-case reand §68.25 is less than the distance to any public receptor, as detailed.				
☐ Emergency response procedures have been coordinated between planning and response organizations [68.10(g)(3)]	the stationary source and local emergency			
8. Does the covered process meet the eligibility requirements of Program	3? Specifically: [68.10(i)]	■Y	$\square N$	□N/A
\Box The process does not meet the eligibility requirements of Program	n 1. [68.10(i)]; and			
Is the covered process any of the following NAICS codes: [68.10(i)(1)]			
□ 32211, 32411, 32511, 325181, 325188, 325192, 325199, 32	5211, 325311, or 32532; or			
\square Is the process subject to the OSHA process safety management s	tandard, 29 CFR 1910.119? [68.10(i)(2)]			
9. Does the covered process fail to meet the eligibility requirements of Process a Program 2)? [68.10(h)]	rogram 1 and Program 3 (i.e., is the covered	□Y	■N	□N/A
General: Management [68.15]				
Has the owner or operator:				
10. Developed a management system to oversee the implementation of the [68.15(a)]	e risk management program elements?	■Y	□N	□N/A
11. Assigned a qualified person or position that has the overall responsibilintegration of the risk management program elements? [68.15(b)]	lity for the development, implementation, and	■Y	□N	□N/A
12. Documented other persons responsible for implementing individual re and defined the lines of authority through an organization chart or sim		□Y	■N	□N/A
Subpart B - Hazard Assessment [68.20-68.42]				
Hazard assessment conducted and documented as provided in 40 CFR 68.2 Comments:	20-68.42?			
Page 3	of 19			

RI	MP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauke	ee Pk		
Ha	zard Assessment: Offsite consequence analysis parameters [68.22]			
1.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for a worst-case scenario: [68.22(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]			
	\Box For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]; or			
	\Box For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m ² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)]			
	☐ For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]			
2.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for an alternative release scenario: [68.22(a)]	■Y	\square N	□N/A
	For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]			
	☐ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]			
	\square For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m ² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)]			
	☐ For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]			
3.	Used appropriate wind speeds and stability classes for the release analysis? [68.22(b)]	■Y	$\square N$	$\square N/A$
4.	Used appropriate ambient temperature and humidity values for the release analysis? [68.22(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
5.	Used appropriate values for the height of the release for the release analysis? [68.22(d)]	■Y	$\square N$	□N/A
6.	Used appropriate surface roughness values for the release analysis? [68.22(e)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
7.	Do tables and models, used for dispersion analysis of toxic substances, appropriately account for dense or neutrally buoyant gases? [68.22(f)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
8.	Were liquids, other than gases liquefied by refrigeration only, considered to be released at the highest daily maximum temperature, based on data for the previous three years appropriate for a stationary source, or at process temperature, whichever is higher? [68.22(g)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Ha	zard Assessment: Worst-case release scenario analysis [68.25]			
9.	Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario estimated to create the greatest distance to an endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated toxic substance from covered processes under worst-case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(i)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
10.	Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario estimated to create the greatest distance to an endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated flammable substance from covered processes under worst-case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(ii)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
11.	Analyzed and reported in the RMP additional worst-case release scenarios for a hazard class if the worst-case release from another covered process at the stationary source potentially affects public receptors different from those potentially affected by the worst-case release scenario developed under 68.25(a)(2)(i) or 68.25(a)(2)(ii)? [68.25(a)(2)(iii)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
12.	Has the owner or operator determined the worst-case release quantity to be the greater of the following: [68.25(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	☐ If released from a vessel, the greatest amount held in a single vessel, taking into account administrative controls that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(1)]			
	☐ If released from a pipe, the greatest amount held in the pipe, taking into account administrative controls that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(2)]			

RMP	Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauke	e Pk		
13.a.	Has the owner or operator for <u>toxic substances</u> that are <u>normally gases</u> at <u>ambient temperature and handled as a gressure</u> :	as or liq	uid und	<u>er</u>
13.a.(1)	Assumed the whole quantity in the vessel or pipe would be released as a gas over 10 minutes? [68.25(c)(1)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.a.(2)	Assumed the release rate to be the total quantity divided by 10, if there are no passive mitigation systems in place? [68.25(c)(1)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.b.	Has the owner or operator for toxic gases handled as refrigerated liquids at ambient pressure:			
13.b.(1)	Assumed the substance would be released as a gas in 10 minutes, if not contained by passive mitigation systems or if the contained pool would have a depth of 1 cm or less? [68.25(c)(2)(i)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.b.(2)) If released substance would be contained by passive mitigation systems in a pool with a depth > 1 cm;	$\Box Y$	□N	■N/A
	☐ Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe (as determined per 68.25(b)) would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]			
	□ Calculated the volatility rate at the boiling point of the substance and at the conditions specified in 68.25(d)? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]			
13.c.	Has the owner or operator for toxic substances that are normally liquids at ambient temperature:			
13.c.(1)	Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(d)(1)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
13.c.(2)	Determined the surface area of the pool by assuming that the liquid spreads to 1 cm deep, if there is no passive mitigation system in place that would serve to contain the spill and limit the surface area, or if passive mitigation is in place, was the surface area of the contained liquid used to calculate the volatilization rate? [68.25(d)(1)(i)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
13.c.(3)	Taken into account the actual surface characteristics, if the release would occur onto a surface that is not paved or smooth? [68.25(d)(1)(ii)]	ПΥ	□N	■N/A
13.c.(4)	Determined the volatilization rate by accounting for the highest daily maximum temperature in the past three years, the temperature of the substance in the vessel, and the concentration of the substance if the liquid spilled is a mixture or solution? [68.25(d)(2)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
13.c.(5)	Determined the rate of release to air from the volatilization rate of the liquid pool? [68.25(d)(3)]	\Box Y	■N	□N/A
13.c.(6)	Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.25(d)(3)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)] ALOHA and MarPlot			
13.d.	Has the owner or operator for <u>flammable gases</u> :			
13.d.(1)	Assumed the quantity in a vessel(s) of flammable gas held as a gas or liquid under pressure is released as a gas over 10 minutes resulting in a vapor cloud explosion? [68.25(e)(1)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.d.(2)	For gas handled as refrigerated liquid that is not contained by passive mitigation systems, assumed the total quantity in a vessel(s) of refrigerated liquid is released as a gas over 10 minutes resulting in a vapor cloud explosion? [68.25(e)(2)(i)]	□Ч	□N	■N/A
13.d.(3)	For gas handled as refrigerated liquid released to a contained area, assumed the quantity volatilized in 10 minutes results in a vapor cloud? [68.25(e)(2)(ii)]	ПΥ	□N	■N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist	Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauke	e Pk		
13.d.(4) Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy to the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based or		□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.e. Has the owner or operator for <u>flammable liquids:</u>				
13.e.(1) Assumed the entire quantity in the vessel or pipe, takin maximum quantity, would be spilled instantaneously to	g into account administrative controls that limit the form a liquid pool? [68.25(f)(1)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.e.(2) For liquids at temperatures below their atmospheric be point of the substance and at the conditions specified in vapor in the first 10 minutes is involved in the vapor cl	68.25(d) and assumed that the quantity which becomes	□Ү	□N	■N/A
13.e.(3) Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy is to the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based or		□Ү	□N	■N/A
14. Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance	to the endpoints? [68.25(g)]	■Y	\Box N	□N/A
15. Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodolo any other publicly available techniques that account for the applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary model provided the owner or operator allows the implementing ag and differences from publicly available models to local emergence.	modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as a stat account for the modeling conditions may be used ency access to the model and describes model features ergency planners upon request? [68.25(g)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [6	8.25(g)] ALOHA and Marriot			
16. Ensured that the passive mitigation system, if considered, is scenario and will still function as intended? [68.25(h)]	capable of withstanding the release event triggering the	□Ү	□N	■N/A
17. Considered also the following factors in selecting the worst	-case release scenarios: [68.25(i)]	$\Box Y$	■N	□N/A
☐ Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperatu	re or pressure? [68.25(i)(1)]			
□ Proximity to the boundary of the stationary source? [6	8.25(i)(2)]			
Hazard Assessment: Alternative release scenario analysis [68	3.28]			
18. Identified and analyzed at least one alternative release scenario to reprocess(es) and at least one alternative release scenario to reprocesses? [68.28(a)]		■Y	□N	□N/A
19. Selected a scenario: [68.28(b)]		■Y	\square N	□N/A
■ That is more likely to occur than the worst-case release	scenario under 68.25? [68.28(b)(1)(i)]			
\Box That will reach an endpoint off-site, unless no such see	nario exists? [68.28(b)(1)(ii)]			
20. Considered release scenarios which included, but are not lir	nited to, the following: [68.28(b)(2)]	□Y	■N	□N/A
☐ Transfer hose releases due to splits or sudden hose unc	oupling? [68.28(b)(2)(i)]			
□ Process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, [68.28(b)(2)(ii)]	welds, valves and valve seals, and drains or bleeds?			
☐ Process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal fail	ure, or drain, bleed, or plug failure? [68.28(b)(2)(iii)]			
☐ Vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and v [68.28(b)(2)(iv)]	venting through relief valves or rupture disks?			
☐ Shipping container mishandling and breakage or punct	uring leading to a spill? [68.28(b)(2)(v)]			
21. Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance	to the endpoints? [68.28(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
		•		

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauk	ee Pk		
22. Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.28(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)] ALOHA and MarPlot			
23. Ensured that the passive and active mitigation systems, if considered, are capable of withstanding the release event triggering the scenario and will be functional? [68.28(d)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
24. Considered the following factors in selecting the alternative release scenarios: [68.28(e)]	\Box Y	■N	□N/A
☐ The five-year accident history provided in 68.42? [68.28(e)(1)]			
☐ Failure scenarios identified under 68.50? [68.28(e)(2)]			
Hazard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30]			
25. Estimated population that would be included within a circle where its center is the point of the release and a radius determined by the distance to the endpoint? [68.30(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
26. Identified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings in the RMP? [68.30(b)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
27. Used most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)]	■Y	\square N	□N/A
28. Estimated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Hazard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts–Environment [68.33]			
29. Identified environmental receptors within a circle where its center is the point of the release and a radius determined by the distance to the endpoint? [68.33(a)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
30. Relied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify environmental receptors? [Source may have used LandView to obtain information] [68.33(b)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
Hazard Assessment: Review and update [68.36]			
31. Reviewed and updated the off-site consequence analyses at least once every five years? [68.36(a)]	\Box Y	□N	□N/A
32. Completed a revised analysis and submit a revised RMP within six months of a change in processes, quantities stored or handled, or any other aspect that might reasonably be expected to increase or decrease the distance to the endpoint by a factor of two or more? [68.36(b)]	□Ү	□N	□N/A
Hazard Assessment: Documentation [68.39]			
33. Has the owner or operator maintained the following records on the offsite consequence analyses:			
33.a For worst-case scenarios: a description of the vessel or pipeline and substance selected, assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for selection, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and passive mitigation on the release quantity and rate? [68.39(a)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
33.b For alternative release scenarios: a description of the scenarios identified, assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for the selection of specific scenarios, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and mitigation on the release quantity and rate? [68.39(b)]	□Ү	■N	□N/A
33.c Documentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? [68.39(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
33.d Methodology used to determine distance to endpoints? [68.39(d)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	•		

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauk	ee Pk		
33.e Data used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected? [68.39(e)]	\Box Y	■N	□N/A
Hazard Assessment: Five-year accident history [68.42]			
34. Has the owner or operator included all accidental releases from covered processes that resulted in deaths, injuries, or significant property damage on site, or known offsite deaths, injuries, evacuations, sheltering in place, property damage, or environmental damage? [68.42(a)]	□Ч	□N	■N/A
35. Has the owner or operator reported the following information for each accidental release: [68.42(b)]	$\Box Y$	$\square N$	■N/A
\Box Date, time, and approximate duration of the release? [68.42(b)(1)]			
\Box Chemical(s) released? [68.42(b)(2)]			
☐ Estimated quantity released in pounds and percentage weight in a mixture (toxics)? [68.42(b)(3)]			
\square NAICS code for the process? [68.42(b)(4)]			
\Box The type of release event and its source? [68.42(b)(5)]			
☐ Weather conditions (if known)? [68.42(b)(6)]			
☐ On-site impacts? [68.42(b)(7)]			
☐ Known offsite impacts? [68.42(b)(8)]			
☐ Initiating event and contributing factors (if known)? [68.42(b)(9)]			
\square Whether offsite responders were notified (if known)? [68.42(b)(10)]			
\Box Operational or process changes that resulted from investigation of the release? [68.42(b)(11)]			
Subpart D - Program 3 Prevention Program [68.65-68.87]			
Implemented the Program 3 prevention requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.48 - 68.60? Comments:			
Prevention Program: Process safety information [68.65]			
1. Has the owner or operator compiled written process safety information, which includes information pertaining to the hazards of the regulated substances used or produced by the process, information pertaining to the technology of the process, and information pertaining to the equipment in the process, before conducting any process hazard analysis required by the rule? [68.65(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Does the process safety information contain the following for hazards of the substances: [68.65(b)]			
■ Toxicity information? [68.65(b)(1)]			
■ Permissible exposure limits? [68.65(b)(2)]			
■ Physical data? [68.65(b)(3)]			
Reactivity data? [68.65(b)(4)]			
■ Corrosivity data? [68.65(b)(5)]			
■ Thermal and chemical stability data? [68.65(b)(6)]			
Hazardous effects of inadvertent mixing of materials that could foreseeably occur? [68.65(b)(7)]			
Note: Safety Data Sheets (SDS) meeting the requirements of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard [29 CFR 1910.1200(g)] may be used to comply with this requirement to the extent they contain the information required by 68.65(b).			

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milw	vaukee P H	_
2. Does the process safety information contain information pertaining to technology of the process [68.65(c)]?	■Y □N □N/A	
Does the information concerning the technology of the process include the following: [68.65(c)(1)]		
■ A block flow diagram or simplified process flow diagram? [68.65(c)(1)(i)]		
Process chemistry? $[68.65(c)(1)(ii)]$		
■ Maximum intended inventory? [68.65(c)(1)(iii)]		
■ Safe upper and lower limits for such items as temperatures, pressures, flows, or compositions? [68.65(c)(1)]	l)(iv)]	
\blacksquare An evaluation of the consequences of deviation? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)]		
3. Does the process safety information contain information pertaining to the equipment in the process? [68.65(d)]] ■Y □N □N/A	
Does the information pertaining to the equipment in the process include the following: [68.65(d)(1)]		
\blacksquare Materials of construction? $68.65(d)(1)(i)$		
■ Piping and instrumentation diagrams [68.65(d)(1)(ii)]		
■ Electrical classification? [68.65(d)(1)(iii)]		
Relief system design and design basis? [68.65(d)(1)(iv)]		
■ Ventilation system design? $[68.65(d)(1)(v)]$		
■ Design codes and standards employed? [68.65(d)(1)(vi)]		
■ Material and energy balances for processes built after June 21, 1999? [68.65(d)(1)(vii)]		
■ Safety systems? [68.65(d)(1)(viii)]		
4. Has the owner or operator documented that equipment complies with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices? [68.65(d)(2)]	□Y ■N □N/A	
5. Has the owner or operator determined and documented that existing equipment, designed and constructed in accordance with codes, standards, or practices that are no longer in general use, is designed, maintained, inspect tested, and operating in a safe manner? [68.65(d)(3)]	cted,	
Prevention Program: Process hazard analysis [68.67]		
6. Has the owner or operator performed an initial process hazard analysis (PHA), and has this analysis identified, evaluated, and controlled the hazards involved in the process? [68.67(a)]	□Y □N □N/A	
7. Has the owner or operator determined and documented the priority order for conducting PHAs, and was it based an appropriate rationale? [68.67(a)]	ed on $\square Y \square N \square N/A$	
8. Has the owner used one or more of the following technologies to conduct process PHA: [68.67(b)]	■Y □N □N/A	
■ What-if? [68.67(b)(1)]		
■ Checklist? [68.67(b)(2)]		
☐ What-if/Checklist? [68.67(b)(3)]		
☐ Hazard and Operability Study (HAZOP) [68.67(b)(4)]		
☐ Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) [68.67(b)(5)]		
☐ Fault Tree Analysis? [68.67(b)(6)]		
☐ An appropriate equivalent methodology? [68.67(b)(7)]		
	•	

10. Was leas med	the PHA address: The hazards of the process? [68.67(c)(1)] Identification of any incident that had a likely potential for catastrophic consequences? [68.67(c)(2)] Engineering and administrative controls applicable to hazards and interrelationships?[68.67(c)(3)] Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)] Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)] Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)] as the PHA performed by a team with expertise in engineering and process operations and did the team include at	□Υ	■N	□N/A
10. Wa leas mei	Identification of any incident that had a likely potential for catastrophic consequences? [68.67(c)(2)] Engineering and administrative controls applicable to hazards and interrelationships?[68.67(c)(3)] Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)] Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)] Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10. Wa leas mei	Engineering and administrative controls applicable to hazards and interrelationships?[68.67(c)(3)] Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)] Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)] Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10. Wa leas mei	Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)] Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)] Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10. Wa leas mei	Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)] Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10. Wa leas mei	Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10. Wa leas	A qualitative evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
10. Wa				
leas mei	as the PHA performed by a team with expertise in engineering and process operations and did the team include at			
լսօ	st one employee who has experience and knowledge specific to the process being evaluated and at least one mber of the team who is knowledgeable in the specific process hazard analysis methodology being used?? 8.67(d)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
11. Has	s the owner or operator completed the following: [68.67(e)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	Established a system to promptly address the team's findings and recommendations?			
	Assured that the recommendations are resolved in a timely manner and documented?			
	Documented what actions are to be taken?			
	Completed actions as soon as possible?			
	Developed a written schedule of when these actions are to be completed? and			
	Communicated the actions to operating, maintenance, and other employees whose work assignments are in the process and who may be affected by the recommendations?			
	s the PHA been updated and revalidated by a team every five years after the completion of the initial PHA to ure that the PHA is consistent with the current process? [68.67(f)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	s the owner or operator retained PHAs and updates or revalidations for each process covered, as well as the olution of recommendations for the life of the process? [68.67(g)]	□Ү	□N	□N/A
Prevent	tion Program: Operating procedures [68.69]			
step	s the owner or operator developed and implemented written operating procedures that provide instructions or ps for conducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information? (3.69(a))	■Y	□N	□N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee P					
15.	Do the p	procedures address the following: [68.69(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	Steps fo	r each operating phase: [68.69(a)(1)]			
		Initial Startup? [68.69(a)(1)(i)]			
		Normal operations? [68.69(a)(1)(ii)]			
		Temporary operations? [68.69((a)(1)(iii)]			
		Emergency shutdown including the conditions under which emergency shutdown is required, and the assignment of shutdown responsibility to qualified operators to ensure that emergency shutdown is executed in a safe and timely manner? [68.69(a)(1)(iv)]			
		Emergency operations? [68.69(a)(1)(v)]			
		Normal shutdown? [68.68(a)(1)(vi)]			
		Startup following a turnaround, or after emergency shutdown? [68.69(a)(1)(vii)]			
	Operatin	ng limits: [68.69(a)(2)]			
		Consequences of deviations [68.69(a)(2)(i)]			
		Steps required to correct or avoid deviation? [68.69(a)(2)(ii)]			
	Safety a	nd health considerations: [68.69(a)(3)]			
		Properties of, and physical hazards presented by, the chemicals used in the process [68.69(a)(3)(i)]			
		Precautions necessary to prevent exposure, including engineering controls, administrative controls, and personal protective equipment? [68.69(a)(3)(ii)]			
		Control measures to be taken if physical contact or airborne exposure occurs? [68.69(a)(3)(iii)]			
		Quality control for raw materials and control of hazardous chemical inventory levels? [68.69(a)(3)(iv)]			
		Any special or unique hazards? [68.69(a)(3)(v)]			
	■ Saf	ety systems and their functions? [68.69(a)(4)]			
16.	Are ope	rating procedures readily accessible to employees who are involved in a process? [68.69(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
17.	procedu changes	owner or operator certified annually that the operating procedures are current and accurate and that res have been reviewed as often as necessary to assure that they reflect current operating practice, including that result from changes in process chemicals, technology, and equipment, and changes to stationary [68.69(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
18.	during s	owner or operator developed and implemented safe work practices to provide for the control of hazards pecific operations, such as lockout/tagout; confined space entry; opening process equipment or piping; and over entrance into a stationary source by maintenance, contractor, laboratory, or other support personnel? [3]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Pre	vention l	Program: Training [68.71]			
19.		n employee involved in operating a process, and each employee before being involved in operating a newly process, been initially trained in an overview of the process and in the operating procedures? [68.71(a)(1)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
20.		al training include emphasis on safety and health hazards, emergency operations including shutdown, and k practices applicable to the employee's job tasks? [68.71(a)(1)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
21.	operator	f initial training for those employees already involved in operating a process on June 21, 1999, an owner or may certify in writing that the employee has the required knowledge, skills, and abilities to safely carry out as and responsibilities as specified in the operating procedures [68.71(a)(2)]	■Y	□N	□N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauke	e Pk		
22. Has refresher training been provided at least every three years, or more often if necessary, to each employee involved in operating a process to assure that the employee understands and adheres to the current operating procedures of the process? [68.71(b)]	□Ү	□N	□N/A
23. Has owner or operator ascertained and documented in record that each employee involved in operating a process has received and understood the training required? [68.71(c)]	■Y	\Box N	□N/A
24. Does the prepared record contain the identity of the employee, the date of the training, and the means used to verify that the employee understood the training? [68.71(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Prevention Program: Mechanical integrity [68.73]			
25. Has the owner or operator established and implemented written procedures to maintain the on-going integrity of the process equipment listed in 68.73(a)? [68.73(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
26. Has the owner or operator trained each employee involved in maintaining the on-going integrity of process equipment? [68.73(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
27. Has the owner or operator performed inspections and tests on process equipment? [68.73(d)(1)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
28. Has the owner or operator followed recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices for inspections and testing procedures? [68.73(d)(2)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
29. Has the owner or operator ensured the frequency of inspections and tests of process equipment is consistent with applicable manufacturers' recommendations, good engineering practices, and prior operating experience? [68.73(d)(3)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
30. Has the owner or operator documented each inspection and test that had been performed on process equipment, and identified the following: [68.73(d)(4)] ■ The date of the inspection or test? ■ The name of the person who performed the inspection or test? ■ The serial number or other identifier of the equipment on which the inspection or test was performed? ■ A description of the inspection or test performed? and ■ The results of the inspection or test?	■Y	□N	□N/A
31. Has the owner or operator corrected deficiencies in equipment that were outside acceptable limits defined by the process safety information before further use or in a safe and timely manner when necessary means were taken to assure safe operation? [68.73(e)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
32. Has the owner or operator assured that equipment as it was fabricated is suitable for the process application for which it will be used in the construction of new plants and equipment? [68.73(f)(1)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
33. Has the owner or operator performed appropriate checks and inspections to assure that equipment was installed properly and consistent with design specifications and the manufacturer's instructions? [68.73(f)(2)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
34. Has the owner or operator assured that maintenance materials, spare parts and equipment were suitable for the process application for which they would be used? [68.73(f)(3)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Prevention Program: Management of change [68.75]			
35. Has the owner or operator established and implemented written procedures to manage changes to process chemicals, technology, equipment, and procedures, and changes to stationary sources that affect a covered process? [68.75(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee				
36. Do procedures assure that the following considerations are a	ddressed prior to any change: [68.75(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
■ The technical basis for the proposed change? [68.75(b)(1)]			
■ Impact of change on safety and health? [68.75(b)(2)]				
■ Modifications to operating procedures? [68.75(b)(3)]				
\blacksquare Necessary time period for the change? [68.75(b)(4)]				
Authorization requirements for the proposed change? [6]	8.75(b)(5)]			
37. Were employees, involved in operating a process and mainted be affected by a change in the process, informed of, and train affected parts of the process? [68.75(c)]		■Y	□N	□N/A
38. If a change resulted in a change in the process safety information [68.75(d)]	ation, was such information updated accordingly?	■Y	□N	□N/A
39. If a change resulted in a change in the operating procedures updated accordingly? [68.75(e)]	or practices, had such procedures or practices been	■Y	□N	□N/A
Prevention Program: Pre-startup safety review [68.77]				
40. Has the owner or operator performed a pre-startup safety revistationary sources when the modification is significant enouginformation? [68.77(a)]		■Y	□N	□N/A
41. Does the pre-startup safety review confirm the following prie process: [68.77(b)]	or to the introduction of a regulated substance to a	■Y	□N	□N/A
☐ Construction and equipment was in accordance with des	sign specifications? [68.77(b)(1)]			
☐ Safety, operating, maintenance, and emergency procedu	res were in place and were adequate? [68.77(b)(2)]			
☐ For new stationary sources, a process hazard analysis har resolved or implemented before startup? [68.77(b)(3)]	ad been performed and recommendations had been			
☐ Modified stationary sources meet the requirements cont	ained in management of change? [68.77(b)(3)]			
☐ Training of each employee involved in operating a proc	ess had been completed? [68.77(b)(4)]			
Prevention Program: Compliance audits [68.79]				
42. Has the owner or operator certified that the stationary source prevention program at least every three years to verify that the being followed? [68.79(a)]		■Y	□N	□N/A
43. Has the audit been conducted by at least one person knowled	geable in the process? [68.79(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
44. Are the audit findings documented in a report? [68.79(c)]		■Y	□N	□N/A
45. Has the owner or operator promptly determined and docume the audit and documented that deficiencies had been corrected.		■Y	□N	□N/A
46. Has the owner or operator retained the two most recent comp	pliance reports? [68.79(e)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Prevention Program: Incident investigation [68.81]				
47. Has the owner or operator investigated each incident that res catastrophic release of a regulated substance? [68.81(a)]	ulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in a	□Ү	□N	■N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwauko	ee Pk		
48. Were all incident investigations initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident? [68.81(b)]	$\Box Y$	□N	■N/A
49. Was an accident investigation team established and did it consist of at least one person knowledgeable in the process involved, including a contract employee if the incident involved work of a contractor, and other persons with appropriate knowledge and experience to thoroughly investigate and analyze the incident? [68.81(c)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
50. Was a report prepared at the conclusion of every investigation? [68.81(d)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
51. Does every report include: [68.81(d)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
\Box Date of incident? [68.81(d)(1)]			
☐ Date investigation began? [68.81(d)(2)]			
\Box A description of the incident? [68.81(d)(3)]			
\Box The factors that contributed to the incident? [68.81(d)(4)]			
\Box Any recommendations resulting from the investigation? [68.81(d)(5)]			
52. Has the owner or operator established a system to promptly address and resolve the incident report findings and recommendations, and are the resolutions and corrective actions documented? [68.81(e)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
53. Was the report reviewed with all affected personnel whose job tasks are relevant to the incident findings including contract employees where applicable? [68.81(f)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
54. Has the owner or operator retained incident investigation reports for at least five years? [68.81(g)]	\Box Y	\square N	■N/A
Prevention Program: Employee participation [68.83]			
55. Has the owner or operator developed a written plan of action regarding the implementation of the employee participation required by this section? [68.83(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
56. Has the owner or operator consulted with employees and their representatives on the conduct and development of process hazards analyses and on the development of the other elements of process safety management in chemical accident prevention provisions? [68.83(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
57. Has the owner or operator provided to employees and their representatives access to process hazards analyses and to all other information required to be developed under the chemical accident prevention rule? [68.83(c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Prevention Program: Hot work permit [68.85]			
58. Has the owner or operator issued a hot work permit for each hot work operation conducted on or near a covered process? [68.85(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
59. Does the permit document that the fire prevention and protection requirements in 29CFR 1910.252(a) have been implemented prior to beginning the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
60. Does the permit indicate the date(s) authorized for hot work and the object(s) upon which hot work is to be performed? [68.85(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
61. Are the permits being kept on file until completion of the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
Prevention Program: Contractors [68.87]			
62. Has the owner or operator obtained and evaluated information regarding the contract owner or operator's safety performance and programs when selecting a contractor? [68.87(b)(1)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
63. Has the owner or operator informed contract owner or operator of the known potential fire, explosion, or toxic release hazards related to the contractor's work and the process? [68.87(b)(2)]	■Y	□N	□N/A

response or the emergency action program? [68.87(b)(3)] 65. Has the owner or operator developed and implemented safe work practices consistent with §68.69(d), to control the entrance, presence, and exit of the contract owner or operator and contract employees in the covered process areas? [68.87(b)(4)] 66. Periodically evaluated the performance of the contract owner or operator in fulfilling their obligations (as described at 68.87(c)(1) – (c)(5))? [68.87(b)(5)] Subpart E - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.96] Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.96? Comments: 1. Is the facility designated as a "responding stationary source"? 1. Is the facility is not a responding stationary source, it need not comply with §68.95 if the following conditions are met:	
entrance, presence, and exit of the contract owner or operator and contract employees in the covered process areas? [68.87(b)(4)] 66. Periodically evaluated the performance of the contract owner or operator in fulfilling their obligations (as described at 68.87(c)(1) – (c)(5))? [68.87(b)(5)] Subpart E - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.96] Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.96? Comments: 1. Is the facility designated as a "responding stationary source"? 1.a. If the facility is not a responding stationary source, it need not comply with §68.95 if the following conditions are met: 1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities, □Y □N	□N/A
at 68.87(c)(1) – (c)(5))? [68.87(b)(5)] Subpart E - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.96] Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.96? Comments: 1. Is the facility designated as a "responding stationary source"? 1.a. If the facility is not a responding stationary source, it need not comply with §68.95 if the following conditions are met: 1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities,	□N/A
Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.96? Comments: 1. Is the facility designated as a "responding stationary source"? 1.a. If the facility is not a responding stationary source, it need not comply with §68.95 if the following conditions are met: 1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities,	□N/A
Comments: 1. Is the facility designated as a "responding stationary source"? 1.a. If the facility is not a responding stationary source, it need not comply with §68.95 if the following conditions are met: 1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities, □Y □N	
1.a. If the facility is not a responding stationary source, it need not comply with §68.95 if the following conditions are met: 1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities, □Y □N	
1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities, □Y □N	□N/A
included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)] 1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities,	
	□N/A
	■N/A
1.a.(3) Are appropriate mechanisms in place to notify emergency responders when there is need for a response? [68.90(b)(3)]	□N/A
1.a.(4) As of September 21, 2018, has the owner or operator performed the annual emergency response coordination activities required under § 68.93? [68.90(b)(4)] (See Items 2 through 5)	□N/A
1.a.(5) Has the owner or operator performed the annual notification exercises required under § 68.96(a) before December 19, 2024? [68.90(b)(5)] (See Items 6 and 7)	■N/A
For non-responding stationary sources where 1.a.(1)-(5) are all marked as 'Y', proceed to Subpart E Item 2	
1.b. If the facility is a responding stationary source:	
1.b.(1) Has the owner or operator developed and implemented an emergency response program that includes the elements required in § $68.95(a)(1-4)$? [$68.95(a)$] (See Items $1.b.(2) - 1.b.(5)$)	■N/A
1.b.(2). An emergency response plan is maintained at the stationary source and contains the following? $[68.95(a)(1)]$ $\square Y$ $\square N$	■N/A
Procedures for informing the public and the appropriate Federal, state, and local emergency response agencies about accidental releases? [68.95(a)(1)(i)]	
□ Documentation of proper first-aid and emergency medical treatment necessary to treat accidental human exposures? [68.95(a)(1)(ii)]	
Procedures and measures for emergency response after an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.95(a)(1)(iii)]	
1.b.(3) Does the emergency response program contains procedures for the use of emergency response equipment and for its inspection, testing, and maintenance? [68.95(a)(2)]	■N/A
1.b.(4) Does the emergency response program include training for all employees in relevant procedures? [68.95(a)(3)] $\Box Y \Box N$	■N/A
1.b.(5) Does the emergency response program include procedures to review and update, as appropriate, the emergency response plan to reflect changes at the stationary source and ensure that employees are informed of changes? [68.95(a)(4)]	■N/A

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee				
1.b.(6) Does the emergency response program include a written regulations or is consistent with the approach in the Natio Guidance ("One Plan")? If so, does the plan include the complies with paragraph (c) of 68.95? [68.95(b)]	onal Response Team's Integrated Contingency Plan	□Ү	□N	■N/A
1.b.(7) Has the emergency response plan been coordinated with under EPCRA? [68.95(c)]	the community emergency response plan developed	□Ү	\Box N	■N/A
1.b.(8) Has the owner or operator developed and implemented at program, including the emergency plan required under §		□Ү	□N	■N/A
1.b.(9) Do the exercises involve facility emergency response per contractors? [68.96(b)]	sonnel and, as appropriate, emergency response	□Ү	\Box N	■N/A
1.b.(10) When planning emergency response field and tabletop ex local public emergency response officials and invite them		□Ү	□N	■N/A
1.b.(11) Does the emergency response exercise program include:	[68.96(b)]	\Box Y	□N	■N/A
☐ Emergency response field exercises? [68.96(b)(1)]				
☐ Tabletop exercises? [68.96(b)(2)]				
\Box Documentation? [68.96(b)(3)]				
1.b.(12) As part of coordination with local emergency response of these officials to establish an appropriate frequency for		□Ү	□N	■N/A
1.b.(13) Field exercises shall involve tests of the source's emerger response personnel and equipment. Do field exercises inc		□Ү	□N	■N/A
Tests of procedures to notify the public and the appr agencies about an accidental release?	opriate Federal, state, and local emergency response			
☐ Tests of procedures and measures for emergency restreatment?	ponse actions including evacuations and medical			
☐ Tests of communications systems?				
☐ Mobilization of facility emergency response personn	nel, including contractors, as appropriate?			
☐ Coordination with local emergency responders?				
☐ Emergency response equipment deployment?				
☐ Any other action identified in the emergency respons	se program, as appropriate?			
1.b.(14) As part of coordination with local emergency response officials, has the owner or operator consulted with these officials to establish an appropriate frequency for tabletop exercises and conducted a tabletop exercise before December 21, 2026 and at a minimum of at least once every three years thereafter? [68.96(b)(2)(i)]		□Ү	□N	■N/A
1.b.(15) Tabletop exercises shall involve discussions of the source discussions of: [68.96(b)(2)(ii)]	e's emergency response plan. Do the exercises include	□Ү	□N	■N/A
☐ Procedures to notify the public and the appropriate F	Federal, state, and local emergency response agencies?			
☐ Procedures and measures for emergency response in	cluding evacuations and medical treatment?			
☐ Identification of facility emergency response person	nel and/or contractors and their responsibilities?			
☐ Coordination with local emergency responders?				
☐ Procedures for emergency response equipment deplo	pyment?			
☐ Any other action identified in the emergency respons	se plan, as appropriate?			

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee					
1.b.(16) Has the owner or operator prepared an evaluation report wi which included: [68.96(b)(3)]		s the owner or operator prepared an evaluation report within 90 days of each field and tabletop exercise, ich included: [68.96(b)(3)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
		A description of the exercise scenario?			
		Names and organizations of each participant?			
		An evaluation of the exercise results including lessons learned?			
		Recommendations for improvement or revisions to the emergency response exercise program and emergency response program, and a schedule to promptly address and resolve recommendations?			
1.6		s the owner or operator satisfied the requirement to conduct notification, field and/or tabletop exercises ough alternative means such as: [68.96(c)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
		Exercises conducted to meet other Federal, state, or local exercise requirements, provided the exercise meets the requirements of paragraphs (a) and/or (b) of this section, as appropriate. [68.96(c)(1)]			
		Response to an accidental release, provided the response includes the actions indicated in paragraphs (a) and/or (b) of this section, as appropriate. When used to meet field and/or tabletop exercise requirements, the owner or operator shall prepare an after-action report comparable to the exercise evaluation report required in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, within 90 days of the incident. [68.96(c)(2)]			
Fo	r all resp	onding and non-responding stationary sources:			
2.	respons plan an their qu	owner or operator of a stationary source coordinated response needs with local emergency planning and e organizations to determine how the stationary source is addressed in the community emergency response d to ensure that local response organizations are aware of the regulated substances at the stationary source, antities, the risks presented by covered processes, and the resources and capabilities at the stationary source and to an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.93(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
3.	source;	ordination occurred at least annually, and more frequently if necessary, to address changes: At the stationary in the stationary source's emergency response and/or emergency action plan; and/or in the community ncy response plan? [68.93(a)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
4.	Has coo	ordination included providing to the local emergency planning and response organizations? [68.93(b)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
	□ The	e stationary source's emergency response plan if one exists?			
	□ En	nergency action plan?			
	□ U	odated emergency contact information?			
	□ Ot	her information necessary for developing and implementing the local emergency response plan?			
	appr	responding stationary sources, has facility consulted with local emergency response officials to establish opriate schedules and plans for field and tabletop exercises required under §68.96(b)? (See Items 1.b.(8), 10), 1.b.(12), and 1.b.(14))			
5.	As of S [68.93(eptember 21, 2018, has the owner or operator documented coordination with local authorities, including: c)]	■Y	□N	□N/A
		e names of individuals involved and their contact information (phone number, email address, and anizational affiliations)?			
	■ Da	ites of coordination activities?			
	■ Na	ture of coordination activities?			
6.	the stat	owner or operator of a stationary source with any Program 2 or Program 3 process conducted an exercise of onary source's emergency response notification mechanisms before December 19, 2024 and annually er? [68.96(a)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A
		s or operators of responding stationary sources may perform the notification exercise as part of the tabletop d exercises)			

RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Solenis LLC - Milwaukee Pk							
7.		s the owner/operator maintained a written record of each notification exercise conducted over the last five years? .96(a)]	ПΥ	□N	■N/A		
Sı	Subpart G – Risk Management Plan [40 CFR 68.150 – 68.195]						
Do Co							
1.	Do	es the single registration form include, for each covered process: [68.160(b)(7)]	■Y	$\square N$	□N/A		
		The name and CAS number of each regulated substance held above the threshold quantity in the process?					
		The maximum quantity of each regulated substance or mixture in the process (in pounds) to two significant digits?					
		The five- or six-digit NAICS code that most closely corresponds to the process?					
		The correct program level of the process?					
2.		es the registration form include whether a public meeting has been held following an RMP reportable accident, suant to §68.210(b)? [68.160(b)(21)]	□Ү	□N	■N/A		
3.	Do	es the owner or operator provide in the RMP: [68.180(a)]	$\Box Y$	□N	■N/A		
		Name, phone number and email address of local emergency planning and response organizations with which the stationary source last coordinated emergency response efforts, pursuant to $68.10(g)(3)$ or 68.93 ? [68.180(a)(1)]					
		The date of the most recent coordination with the local emergency response organizations, pursuant to §68.93? [68.180(a)(2)]					
		A list of Federal or state emergency plan requirements to which the stationary source is subject? [68.180(a)(3)]					
4.	For	For non-responding stationary sources, does the owner or operator identify: [68.180(b)(1)]		□N	□N/A		
		For stationary sources with any regulated toxic substance held in a process above the threshold quantity, whether the stationary source is included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003, pursuant to §68.90(b)(1)? [68.180(b)(1)(i)]					
		For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above the threshold quantity, the date of the most recent coordination with the local fire department, pursuant to $\S68.90(b)(2)$? $[68.180(b)(1)(ii)]$					
	■ What mechanisms are in place to notify the public and emergency responders when there is a need for emergency response? [68.180(b)(1)(iii)]						
		The date of the most recent notification exercise, as required in §68.96(a)? [68.180(b)(1)(iv)]					
5.	For	responding stationary sources, does the owner or operator identify the date of the most recent: [68.180(b)(2)]	$\Box Y$	□N	■N/A		
		Review and update of the emergency response plan, pursuant to §68.95(a)(4)? [68.180(b)(2)(i)]					
		Notification exercise, as required in §68.96(a)? [68.180(b)(2)(ii)]					
		Field exercise, as required in §68.96(b)(1)? [68.180(b)(2)(iii)]					
		Tabletop exercise, as required in §68.96(b)(2)? [68.180(b)(2)(iv)]					

RI	LC - Milwaukee P			
6.	Has the owner or operator reviewed and updated the RMP and submitted it to EPA for the following	ag: [68.190(a)]? ■Y	□N	□N/A
	Five-year update. [68.190(b)(1)]			
	☐ Within three years of a newly regulated substance listing. [68.190(b)(2)]			
	☐ At the time a new regulated substance is first present in an already regulated process above the quantities. [68.190(b)(3)]	reshold		
	☐ At the time a regulated substance is first present in an new process above threshold quantities.	[68.190(b)(4)]		
	☐ Within six months of a change requiring revised PHA or hazard review. [68.190(b)(5)]			
	☐ Within six months of a change requiring a revised OCA as provided in 68.36. [68.190(b)(6)]			
	☐ Within six months of a change that alters the Program level that applies to any covered proces	s. [68.190(b)(7)]		
7.	If the owner or operator experienced an accidental release that met the five-year accident history re (as described at 68.42) subsequent to April 9, 2004, did the owner or operator submit the informati 68.168, 68.170(j) and 68.175(l) within six months of the release or by the time the RMP was updat 68.190, whichever was earlier. [68.195(a)]	on required at	□N	■N/A
8.	If the emergency contact information required at 68.160(b)(6) has changed since June 21, 2004, did operator submit corrected information within thirty days of the change? [68.195(b)]	d the owner or \textsq Y	□N	■N/A
Su	ubpart H – Other Requirements [40 CFR 68.200 – 68.210]			
	plemented Other Requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.200-68.210? mments:			
1.	Has the owner or operator maintained records supporting the implementation of this part at the stat five years, unless otherwise provided in Subpart D: Program 3 Prevention Program? [68.200]	ionary source for ■Y	□N	□N/A
2.	Did the owner or operator hold a public meeting to provide information required under §68.42(b), to days after any RMP reportable accident at the stationary source with any known offsite impact spec §68.42(a)? [68.210(b)]		□N	■N/A
	Page 19 of 19			